

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pending claims 1, 3-6, 27-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,877 (Nishiyama). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As to claim 1, Nishiyama nowhere discloses either a reconfigurable processor core, nor such a core that includes a plurality of whole processor units. Instead, Nishiyama merely discloses a single CPU 100. For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 3-6 are patentable over Nishiyama. Claim 27 is patentable at least because nowhere does Nishiyama teach or suggest a reconfigurable processor core. Accordingly, claims 27-28 and 30 are patentable over Nishiyama.

Pending claims 2 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishiyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,248 (Georgiou). For at least the same reasons discussed above regarding Nishiyama, claim 2 is patentable as neither reference teaches or suggests a reconfigurable processor core that includes multiple whole processors. As to claim 19, nowhere does Georgiou teach or suggest a buffer coupled between an output of a first processor and an input to a second processor unit. In this regard, the Office Action refers to completion unit 122 of Georgiou. Office Action, p. 5. However, this element is not a buffer that is coupled as set forth in the claim; rather it is a completion unit that is coupled to the outputs of the functional units. Georgiou, col. 6, lns. 5-11. Accordingly, claims 19-20 are patentable over the combination.

Claims 21-23 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishiyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,817 (Ashgar). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As to claim 21 nowhere does Ashgar teach or suggest a radio frequency (RF) wireless transceiver that is part of the same IC as a reconfigurable processor core. That is, Ashgar is merely a DSP that performs baseband (i.e., digital) operations. Accordingly, the contended wireless transceivers of Ashgar (DSP's 212) are not RF wireless transceivers. For at least this reason, claims 21-23 are patentable over the proposed combination.

With respect to claim 24, neither of the references teach or suggest an integrated circuit on a single substrate that includes both a digital portion and an analog portion. For at least this reason, claim 24 and claims 25-26 depending therefrom are patentable over the proposed combination.

Claims 1, 27-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,762 (Nicol). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nowhere does Nicol teach or

suggest a reconfigurable processor core. For at least this reason, claims 1, 27-28 and 30 are patentable over Nicol.


Claim 31 stands rejected under §103(a) over Nicol in view of Ashgar. For the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 21, Ashgar nowhere teaches or suggests a radio frequency wireless transceiver. Accordingly, for this further reason, claim 31 is patentable.

New claims 32-35 are patentable at least for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/31/05



Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1-6. These sheets, which includes FIGS. 1-6, replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1-6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets